



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/408,794	09/30/1999	KAUSHAL KURAPATI	PHA-23,790	4468

7590 05/16/2002

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

QURESHI, SHABANA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

cd

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/408,794

Applicant(s)

KURAPATI ET AL. *cd*

Examiner

Shabana Qureshi

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rapaport et al. (U.S. 5,890,152).

As per claims 1 and 19, Rapaport et al. teach a method of realizing personalized information for a user from multiple information sources, comprising:

- establishing a user profile for the user based on various interests of the user (column 2, lines 41-44);
- establishing a virtual unified space (column 2, lines 27-40);
- populating the virtual unified space with a plurality of different virtual media collections in accordance with the user profile (column 5, lines 36-39); and
- browsing the unified space under user control (column 5, lines 29-42).

As per claim 4, Rapaport et al. teach the method of claim 1 wherein the user profile establishing step comprises loading from memory a previously created user profile (column 6, lines 50-60).

As per claim 5, Rapaport et al. teach the method of claim 1 wherein the user profile establishing step comprises:

Art Unit: 2155

- presenting a variety of questions to the user about the user's interests (column 7, line 53); and
- creating a user profile based on the user's answers to the questions (column 7, lines 51-78).

As per claim 6, Rapaport et al. teach the method of claim 1 wherein the populating step comprises:

- acquiring information items from a plurality of information sources of different media type in accordance with the user profile (figure 15a); and
- placing the information items into the virtual multiple media collections based on their respective information sources (figure 15a).

As per claim 7, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 1 wherein the populating step comprises:

- comparing the user profile with a collective profile database to establish a similar collective profile (column 18, lines 58-67; column 19, lines 1-16);
- acquiring information items from a plurality of information sources of different media type in accordance with the collective profile (column 18, lines 58-67; column 19, lines 1-16); and
- media collections based on their respective information sources (column 18, lines 58-67; column 19, lines 1-16).

As per claim 8, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 7. Rapaport et al. further teach the method comprising :

Art Unit: 2155

- identifying a selection of at least one of the information items by the user from one of the media collections (column 3, lines 22-24); and updating the user profile in accordance with the identifying step (column 3, lines 24-26).

As per claim 11, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 1 further comprising:

- searching the virtual unified space with a search engine under user control (column 5, lines 29-42); and
- updating the user profile in accordance with the search step (column 5, lines 29-42).

As per claim 12, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 11 further comprising storing results of the searching step as media collections in the unified space for browsing by the user (column 5, lines 29-42).

As per claim 13, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 12 further comprising filtering results of the searching step in accordance with the user profile (column 9, 29-39; column 10, lines 32-50).

As per claim 14, Rapaport et al. teach the step of claim 13, further comprising prioritizing results of the searching step in accordance with the user profile (column 38, lines 15-24; column 38, lines 30-35).

As per claim 15, Rapaport et al. teach a receiver apparatus for obtaining content from multiple information sources for viewing by a viewer, comprising:

- an input/output (“I/O”) controller including an Internet connection input, a video output, and a selector input (column 2, lines 29-34);
- and adaptive user profile database (column 2, line 34);

Art Unit: 2155

- a filter coupled to the adaptive user profile database, the filter being coupled to the I/O controller for filtering information from the Internet connection input in accordance with the adaptive user profile database (column 33, lines 36-55; column 13, lines 24-33);
- means for displaying a virtual unified space through the video output (column 2, line 30);
- means for populating the virtual unified space with virtual multiple media collections using the filtered information from the implicit filter (column 33, lines 36-55); and
- means for browsing the unified space in accordance with the selector input (column 33, lines 36-55).

As per claims 9, 16, and 20, Rapaport et al. teach the method of claims 1, 15, and 19 wherein the media collections comprise respective pluralities of similarly classifiable information items, further comprising:

- means for identifying a selection of at least one of the information items by the user from one of the media collections (column 3, lines 22-24); and
- means for updating the user profile in accordance with the identifying step (column 3, lines 24-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 10, 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rapaport et al.

As per claims 2 and 3, Rapaport et al. teach claim 1 above in the disclosure of their invention. Rapaport et al. fail to teach that the virtual unified space is a library or that it comprises a floor of a virtual library. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the virtual unified space to be a library and/or to comprise a floors of a virtual library because doing so would simplify the organization of virtual unified space into a system familiar to the user.

As per claims 10, 17, and 21, Rapaport et al. teach the method of linking two similar profiles and providing them with similar media collections (column 18, lines 58-67; column 19, lines 1-16). Rapaport et al. do not teach the maintaining of a collaborative database. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to augment the user profile in accordance with a collaborative data base because it would decrease the filtering required and could be used to refer the users of common profiles to media collections commonly accessed by users of similar profiles.

As per claim 18, Rapaport et al. teach the method as in claim 17 wherein the I/O controller further comprises an input for receiving television programs, including additional

Art Unit: 2155

information through the television program and electronic program guide information, the filter being coupled to the I/O controller for filtering information from the television program input in accordance with the adaptive user profile database (column 13, lines 24-33). This is inherent to the invention of Rapaport et al., because the invention refers to 'media files', which include television programs.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

SQ
May 13, 2002


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100